

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Office Action mailed 13 November 2006 has been received and reviewed. Each of claims 1–31 stand rejected. Claims 1, 16, and 17 are amended herein. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 16–25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant has amended claims 16 to overcome this rejection.

The Office suggests that the specification and figures does not adequately enable the following features of claim 16: “allowing the system user to alter any one of the identity components without altering the reference; and providing the system user with tools for regulating access to the identity components such that selected known identities have access to selected identity components.”

Applicant amended claim 16 to clarify the scope of the claim language. The claim amendments indicate that the system user may alter the plurality of components associated with the identity reference and may authorize selected components of the plurality of components to receive communications from selected known identities. Support for these amendment, may be found at least in Applicant’s Specification at FIG. 5, FIG. 7, and paragraphs [0033]–[0042].

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 16–25.

Objections based on 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a)

The drawings are objected under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant has amended the features of claim 16 to overcome this objection.

Claim 16 is amended to clarify that the claimed features are related to allowing the system user to alter the plurality of components associated with the identity reference and to authorize selected component of the plurality of components to receive communications from selected known identities. Support for these amendment, may be found at least in Applicant's Specification at FIG. 5, FIG. 7, and paragraphs [0033]–[0042].

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a).

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

A.) Applicable Authority

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdeggal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). *See also*, MPEP § 2131.

B.) Anticipation Rejection Based on US Publ. 2002/0149705 (“Allen”).

Claims 1–6, 8, 10–19, 21–27, and 29–31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Allen. Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of claims

1–6, 8, 10–19 and 21–25 by amending independent claims 1 and 16. Additionally, Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of claims 26–27 and 29–31 by presenting reasons that Allen fails to describe all elements of independent claim 26.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites a method for providing an identity owner a unique identity to manage a collection of electronic devices, owned by the identity owner. The method comprises, among other things, providing identity access tools for allowing the identity owner to select a set of authorized identities that have rights to communicate with the identity owner; and providing device selection tools for allowing the identity owner to select at least one electronic device for reception of communications, wherein the at least one electronic device is authorized, by the identity owner, to accept communications from the authorized identities based on at least one of a time associated with the communications or a format associated with the communications.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Allen, fails to disclose, among other things, *wherein the at least one electronic device is authorized, by the identity owner, to accept communications from the authorized identities based on at least one of a time associated with the communications or a format associated with the communications*, as recited in independent claim 1. The Office relies upon Allen, at FIG 5., paragraphs [0026], [0063]–[0066], and [0091]–[0093] to anticipate the invention of claim 1. The cited portions of Allen describe managing a contact list by synching contact among different devices. Nothing in the cited portions of Allen discloses an identity owner that authorizes at least one electronic device to accept communications from authorized identities based on at least one of a time associated with the communication of a format associate with the communications.

Unlike Allen, the invention of claim 1 recites a method that manages communication delivery to electronic devices based on at least a time of communication and format of communication. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, the anticipation rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2–6, 8, and 10–15 further define novel features of the invention of claim 1 and each depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 2–6, 8, and 10–15 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of dependent claims 2–6, 8, and 10–15 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 16 as amended recites a method for providing a system user a unique reference to manage a collection of components, i.e., electronic devices, owned by the system user. The method comprises, among other things, permitting access to a unique identity belonging to the system user through a unique reference, wherein the unique identity comprises a plurality of components. In turn, the system user is allowed to alter any one of the plurality of components without altering the reference and regulate access to the plurality of components such that selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components, wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user, to accept electronic communications from the selected known identities.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Allen, fails to disclose, among other things, *regulating access to the plurality of components such that selected known identities have access to selected components of the plurality of components, wherein the selected components of the plurality components are authorized, by the system user, to accept*

electronic communications from the selected known identities, as recited in independent claim

16. The Office relies upon Allen, paragraphs [0026], [0063]–[0066], and [0091]–[0100] to anticipate the invention of claim 16. The cited portions of Allen describes managing a contact list by synching contacts among different devices. The cited portion also details changing visual indicators associated with contacts in the contact list. Nothing in the cited portions of Allen discloses a system user that manages a plurality of components by authorizing access to selected components of the plurality of components, where the selected components are authorized to accept communication from the selected known identities.

Unlike Allen, the invention of claim 16 allows a system user to authorize selected components of the plurality of components associated with a unique reference to receive communications from selected entities. Accordingly for at least the above reasons, the anticipation rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 17–19 and 21– 25 further define novel features of the invention of claim 16 and each depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 16. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 17–19 and 21–25 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of dependent claims 17–19 and 21–25 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 26 recites a system for allowing a user having a unique identity to manage communications, wherein the unique identity is associated with a plurality of electronic devices. The system comprises a service for assigning a reference to a user's unique identity, wherein other identities can access the user's unique identity only by using the reference. The system also comprises permission controls for allowing the user to control access to the unique

identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities and allowing the user to select at least one associated device from a plurality of associated devices for receiving communication upon an access attempt by an authorized user.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited prior art, including Allen, fails to disclose, among other things, *permission controls for allowing the user to control access to the unique identity by restricting authorization to a selected set of other identities and permission controls for allowing the user to select at least one associated device from a plurality of associated devices for receiving communication upon an access attempt by an authorized user*, as recited in independent claim 26. The Office relies upon Allen, paragraphs [0063]–[0066], and [0091]–[0100] to anticipate the invention of claim 26. The cited portions of Allen describes managing a contact list by synching contacts among different devices. The cited portion also details changing visual indicators associated with contacts in the contact list. Specifically, Allen at paragraphs [0092]–[0094] teaches a contact entry component that selects external devices, such as a PDA, laptop, or cellular phone, and creates a new contact entry device. Nothing in the cited portions of Allen discloses a system user that manages a plurality of components by authorizing access to selected components of the plurality of components, where the selected components are authorized to accept communication from the selected known identities.

Unlike Allen, the invention of claim 26 allows a user to set preference controls that authorize selected electronic devices of a plurality of electronic devices associated with a unique reference to receive communication from a selected identities. Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, the anticipation rejection of claim 26 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 27 and 29–31 further define novel features of the invention of independent claim 26 and each depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 26.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 26, dependent claims 27 and 29–31 are believed to be in condition for allowance by virtue of their dependency. See 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c). As such, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of dependent claims 27 and 29–31 is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

A.) Applicable Authority

The basic requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness are summarized in MPEP §2143 through §2143.03. In order “[t]o establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success [in combining the references]. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)”. MPEP §2143. Further, in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the initial burden is placed on the Examiner. “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 972, (Bd. Pat App. & Inter. 1985).” *Id.* See also MPEP §706.02(j) and §2142.

B.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Allen *et al* in View of Boman *et al*.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen *et al.* in view of Boman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,257) Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, Allen does not teach all the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over Allen for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Boman fails to cure the deficiencies of Allen with respect to the limitations of claim 1. As such, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 7 is respectfully requested.

C.) Obviousness Rejections Based on Allen *et al* in View of Cannon *et al*.

Claims 9, 20 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen *et al.* in view of Cannon *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,002) Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claims 9, 20, and 28 depend from independent claims 1, 16, and 26, respectively. As discussed above, Allen does not teach all the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 16, and 26. Accordingly, claims 9, 20, and 28 are patentable over Allen for at least the above-cited reasons. The addition of Boman fails to cure the deficiencies of Allen with respect to the limitations of claims 1, 16, and 26. As such, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 9, 20, and 28 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments above place this Application in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. No fee is believed

due in connection with submitting this correspondence, but the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket MFCP.101281.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2007

/s/ Monplaisir Hamilton
Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
600 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005-2004
Phone: (202) 783-8400

Attorney Docket No. MFCP.101281